

**Yee &
Associates, P.C.**

4100 Alpha Road
Suite 1100
Dallas, Texas 75244

Main No. (972) 385-8777
Facsimile (972) 385-7766

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUL 18 2005

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Commissioner for Patents for Examiner Paula W. Klimach Group Art Unit 2135	Facsimile No.: 571/273-8300
From: Michele Morrow Legal Assistant to Francis Lammes	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 9
Message: Enclosed herewith: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transmittal Document; and• Reply Brief.	
Re: Application No. 09/478,309 Attorney Docket No: AUS990809US1	
Date: Monday, July 18, 2005	
Please contact us at (972) 385-8777 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.	<i>This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.</i>

**PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION BY
FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO 972-385-7766.**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Gordon et al.**Serial No.: **09/478,309**Filed: **January 6, 2000**For: **Method and Apparatus for
Securing a Cookie Cache in a Data
Processing System****35525**PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
CUSTOMER NUMBER§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§Group Art Unit: **2135**Examiner: **Klimach, Paula W.**Attorney Docket No.: **AUS990809US1**Certificate of Transmission Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on July 18, 2005.

By:

Michele Morrow
Michele MorrowTRANSMITTAL DOCUMENTCommissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

ENCLOSED HERewith:

- Reply Brief (37 C.F.R. 41.41).

No fees are believed to be required. If, however, any fees are required, I authorize the Commissioner to charge these fees which may be required to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447. No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the extension is requested, and I authorize the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Lammes

Francis Lammes

Registration No. 55,353

Agent for Applicants

Duke W. Yee

Registration No. 34,285

Attorney for Applicants

YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

P.O. Box 802333

Dallas, Texas 75380

(972) 385-8777

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Docket No. AUS990809US1

JUL 18 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: **Gordon et al.**

Serial No. **09/478,309**

Filed: **January 6, 2000**

For: **Method and Apparatus for
Securing a Cookie Cache in a Data
Processing System**

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 2135


Examiner: Klimach, Paula W.

**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Certificate of Transmission (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on July 18, 2005.

By:


Michele Morrow

REPLY BRIEF (37 C.F.R. 41.41)

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on May 18, 2005.

No fees are believed to be required to file a Reply Brief. Any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefore, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF REPLY BRIEF.

(Reply Brief Page 1 of 7)
Gordon et al. - 09/478,309

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The Examiner's Answer states that Appellant's Brief does not contain a statement that the grouping of claims stand or fall together. Appellants respectfully submit that the Rules of Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences; Final Rule issued August 12, 2004, and adopted September 13, 2004, states:

Section 41.37 is added to generally incorporate the requirements of former Rule 192. In addition, the following changes have been made:

...

9) The grouping of claims requirement set forth in former Rule 192(c)(7) is removed. The general purpose served by former Rule 192(c)(7) is addressed in § 41.37(c)(1)(viii). The existing grouping of claims requirement has led to many problems such as (i) Grouping of claims across multiple rejections (e.g., claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over A while claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over A and the appellant states that claims 1-15 are grouped together); (ii) Claims being grouped together but argued separately (e.g., claims 1-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over A, the appellant groups claims 1-9 together but then argues the patentability of claims 1 and 5 separately); and (iii) examiners disagreeing with the appellant's grouping of claims.

In this section, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences has stated that the grouping of claims is removed. Therefore, Appellants respectfully submit that Appellants' Brief is correct.

RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S REMARKS

A. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claims 1-9, 17-29, and 37)

In response to Appellants' assertion that Broadhurst does not teach or suggest storing and comparing both an identification of the requestor and an associated cookie, more specifically, Broadhurst does not store a copy of the cookie that is sent out and Broadhurst does not save the identification of the system to which a cookie is sent, the Examiner's Answer states:

In reference to the stored cookie, the office action mailed out on 10/21/04 the examiner pointed out the modification necessary to Broadhurst in order to store the cookie and why it would be obvious. The rejection states:

"...Although Broadhurst does not expressly disclose storing the cookie, Broadhurst discloses storing the credentials that can be formed into a cookie (column 3 lines 41-48)."

This indication that even though the information for the cookie does not take the form of a cookie it is indeed stored in the directory. This makes the information, required to form the cookie, available for transforming into the more identifiable form of a cookie.

Further more Broadhurst discloses receiving the cookie in order to access the resource. This was stated in the office action mailed on 10/21/04.

"...Sending a first cookie to the requestor in response to the request, wherein the cookie is used to access the resource. (Fig. 2 part 108)."

After receiving the above-mentioned cookie, the system of Broadhurst compares the cookie to the information stored in the directory (this is the above mentioned information that is used to create the cookie) during the process of authentication (Fig. 2 part 112 and 114 in combination with column 4, lines 42-60).

Appellants respectfully submit that it would not be obvious to modify Broadhurst in the manner described by the Examiner. The Examiner indicates that Broadhurst teaches this at column 3, lines 41-48, which reads as follows:

For each user, the directory 16 stores information which allows the user's authentication information to be mapped into a network credential which includes a role of the user. The network credential can then be formed into a cookie. Once logged in and initially authenticated to the network, a user may freely access any of the applications allowed by the role.

In this section, Broadhurst describes that a cookie is formed from a network credential which is a mapped version of the user's authentication information. Thus, the Broadhurst cookie is the user's authentication information which is formed after the user's authentication information is received by the Broadhurst system (see column 3, lines 18-41). Appellants' claimed invention, of claims 1, 21, and 35, recites "sending a first cookie to the requestor in response to the request, wherein the cookie is used to access the resource; and storing an identification of the requestor and the first cookie to form a stored identification and a stored cookie, wherein the identification of the requestor identifies a particular data processing system from which the request originated." Thus, Appellants' cookie is a resource access and is stored in addition to the identification of the requestor. The Examiner clearly alleges that Appellants' identification of the requestor is

equivalent to the Broadhurst's user's authentication information (see Examiner's Answer, page 7). Thus, Broadhurst only maintains the user's authentication information in the form of a cookie and does not store an identification of the requestor and the first cookie, which is sent to the requestor in response to the request and wherein the cookie is used to access the resource, to form a stored identification and a stored cookie.

The Examiner further alleges that Broadhurst teaches receiving the cookie in order to access the resource at Figure 2, step 108, the description of which is as follows:

If there is not yet a user cookie, one is created in step 106 by consulting the directory 16 to map the user's identity to an intermediate identity and a user role, which are used to form a network credential. If no mapping can be found between the user's local identity and a network credential, a "no-map" cookie is created to prevent repeated failed lookups. The user's network credential, including user role, is formed into a cookie by appending the identity of the user's terminal to the credential, and making a cryptographic seal of the result. The cookie is then preferably encoded. As will be appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art, a cookie is a message given to a web browser by a web server to record aspects of the interaction history between the browser and server, and which is stored by the web browser to facilitate access to additional server resources. The cookie is preferably configured to disappear when the browser program is closed by the user. In step 108, the cookie is returned to the browser.

(Column 4, lines 21-39)

As discussed above, and supported by this section of Broadhurst, the cookie created by Broadhurst, which is a map of the user's identity to an intermediate identity and a user role both of which are used to form a network credential, is not a cookie sent to the requestor in response to the request, wherein the cookie is used to access the resource separately from the identification of the requestor. Thus, while the cookie of Broadhurst is sent to a browser, the cookie is the user's identity and role.

In response to Appellants' assertion that there is no motivation to modify Broadhurst to store the cookie and identifier and to compare these to a received request in order to meet the claimed invention, the Examiner's Answer states:

... The Examiner directs attention to Fig. 2 wherein the steps for authentication comprise both authentication of the user ID (Fig. 2 parts 100-102) and a valid cookie (Fig. 2 parts 112-114). Even if Broadhurst did not store user identity and cookie, Broadhurst does carry out authentication using the user identity and cookie and therefore is able to store this information.

As discussed previously, the cookie of Broadhurst is the user's identity formed into a cookie. The cookie of Broadhurst is not a resource access. In Figure 2, Broadhurst describes validating the user's identity (steps 100-102), mapping the identity and forming a cookie (steps 104-108), and using the identity cookie to access information (steps 110-112). Broadhurst does not send a first cookie to the requestor in response to the request, wherein the cookie is used to access the resource, and store an identification of the requestor and the first cookie to form a stored identification and a stored cookie, wherein the identification of the requestor identifies a particular data processing system from which the request originated. Thus, there is not any incentive or motivation to modify Broadhurst to meet the claimed limitations.

Appellants respectfully submit that Broadhurst fails to teach or suggest storing a copy of the cookie that is sent out and saving the identification of the system to which a cookie is sent. Thus, Broadhurst does not teach or suggest storing and comparing both an identification of the requestor and an associated cookie. Therefore, Broadhurst does not perform all of the inventive functionalities claimed by Appellants.

B. GROUND OF REJECTION (Claim 18)

In response to Appellants' assertion that Grantges does not teach or suggest a server that sends a request to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated.

The examiner would like to redirect attention back to Broadhurst who inputs a request to access additional resources which may be associated with the user's initial server or a new server in the network (column 3 lines 49-67). Thus, Broadhurst teaches that the requestor maybe a server. Therefore providing the direction to a proxy server as in Grantges. Further the Grantges reference discloses the proxy server creating a request (column 6, lines 47-51. In addition, the appellant asserts that a cookie is given to a server, rather than to a browser. This is not persuasive because although claim 18 does not claim the server receiving the cookie, a proxy in the system of Grantges stands between the server and the browser and therefore saves and receives the cookie while mapping it to the identity of the browser.

Appellants respectfully submit that Broadhurst does not teach or suggest a server that sends a request to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated.

The Examiner states that this feature is taught by Broadhurst at column 3, lines 49-67, which reads as follows:

To access additional resources not included in the initial list, the user inputs a request to access additional resources, which may be associated with the user's initial server or a new server in the network. Access to the back end or external application is achieved using a script (a series of commands which can be executed without user interaction) or other similar means accessible as a web server resource. The script is written by the system administrator, stored on the same host machine as the web server, and provides the login code for the server/application. The user name and password are not hardcoded into the script, but rather are stored in script access procedure variables (SV) having names chosen by the system administrator. The password values are preferably encrypted to enhance security. The SV's are stored in a database which can be the directory 16 or another suitable database (such as database 19 associated with the server host 13) accessible to the server. According to an aspect of the present invention, in response to a user request through the browser, the script retrieves the SV value from the directory 16 based on an SV name contained in the script, the user's role and identity (contained in a cookie provided to the script). In this manner, the identity and password used by the user to access the third party application are determined by the user's role and individual identity.

In this section, Broadhurst describes a user request to gain access to additional resources that were not included in the initial request. The user requests to access the additional resources, which may be associated with the user's initial server or a new server in the network. Thus, the request is to gain access to a server that may be associated with the user's server or new. There is nothing in this section, or any other section of Broadhurst, that teaches or fairly suggest that a server that sends a request to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated.

Additionally, Appellants respectfully submit that Grantges does not teach or suggest a server that sends a request to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated. The Examiner states that this feature is taught by Grantges at column 6, lines 47-51, which reads as follows:


In response to DMZ proxy server 34's request to establish secure connection 54, gateway proxy server 40 presents its X.509 digital certificate, and requests that DMZ proxy server 34 present its X.509 digital certificate by a return message.

In this section, Grantges is describing a proxy server's request to establish a secure connection. While Grantges may teach a server sending a request, the request is not to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated.

Appellants respectfully submit that Broadhurst and Grantges, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a server that sends a request to access a resource within the data processing system from which a cookie is generated. Thus, Broadhurst and Grantges, taken alone or in combination, do not perform all of the inventive functionalities claimed by Appellants.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-9, 17-29, and 37 are allowable over the cited prior art and that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to not sustain the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action.


Francis Lammes
Reg. No. 55,353
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
PO Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777